## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ANTIGUA COLLEGE OF MEDICINE, A FOREIGN CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

HONORABLE PATRICK J. DUGGAN

v.

No. 10-10978

STEVEN WOODWARD,

Defendant.

#### MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Detroit, Michigan -- Monday, April 19, 2010

### **APPEARANCES:**

Eric A. Buikema, Esq. Steven L. Woodward Cardelli, Lanfear & Buikema, In Pro Per 322 West Lincoln c/o 7211 Brittwood Lane
Royal Oak, Michigan 48067 Flint, Michigan 48507
Tel: (248) 544-1100 steve\_l\_woodward@yahoo.com ebuikema@cardellilaw.com On behalf of Plaintiff

To Obtain A Certified Transcript, Contact: Nefertiti A. Matthews, Official Court Reporter Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 867 Detroit, Michigan 48226 www.transcriptorders.com • jodi matthews@mied.uscourts.gov

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

# Motion For Preliminary Injunction Monday, April 19, 2010

### INDEX

- - -

<u>HEARING</u> : <u>PAGE</u> :	$\overline{\mathtt{AOT}}$ :
Motion for Preliminary Injunction3	1
Argument By Mr. Buikema3	1
Response By Mr. Woodward23	1
Response By Mr. Buikema30	1
Response By Mr. Woodward30	1
Response By Mr. Buikema34	1
Response By Mr. Woodward35	1
Response By Mr. Buikema49	1
Response By Mr. Woodward50	1
Response By Mr. Buikema53	1
Response By Mr. Woodward54	1
Response By Mr. Buikema56	1
Response By Mr. Woodward56	1
Response By Mr. Buikema58	1
Response By Mr. Woodward59	1
Decision By The Court60	1
Response By Mr. Buikema61	1
Certification of Reporter 63	

1	Detroit, Michigan
2	Monday, April 19, 2010
3	1:59 p.m.
4	
5	THE CLERK: Civil action number 10-10978; American
6	University of Antigua College of Medicine versus Steven
7	Woodward.
8	THE COURT: Identify yourselves, for the record,
9	please.
10	MR. BUIKEMA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Eric
11	Buikema of Cardelli, Lanfear & Buikema, for the
12	plaintiff and moving party.
13	MR. WOODWARD: My name is Steven Woodward.
14	THE COURT: All right. Counsel, I believe it's
15	your motion. I'll let you proceed.
16	Motion for Preliminary Injunction
17	ARGUMENT BY MR. BUIKEMA
18	MR. BUIKEMA: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	First of all, I intend to be relatively brief.
20	I'm largely satisfied with our written pleadings in
21	this regard. But there are a few things that I need to
22	point out for purposes of today.
23	As you know, Your Honor, this is a motion for
24	preliminary injunction. We are seeking to have
25	Mr. Woodward cease and desist publication of what we

regard as an offending website containing information 1 2 that is damaging to my client as well as its students. 3 Mr. Woodward is very obviously a student who is dissatisfied with his educational experience at 4 American University of Antigua and he's certainly 5 6 within his rights to express opinions about that. 7 But what he is not permitted to do, under 8 applicable law, are at least three or four things and they include making use of confusingly similar names, 9 10 domain names, specifically, in this case, that confuse 11 or mislead the public as to the origin of his opinions or remarks or publications. 12 13 THE COURT: What is that theory of defense? MR. BUIKEMA: Of defense? 14 15 THE COURT: What's your theory? You list a number 16 of theories. Which theory are you talking about now? 17 MR. BUIKEMA: I'm talking about violation of the 18 Lanham Act, specifically the Anticybersquatting Provision under paren (d). 19 2.0 THE COURT: Fair enough. Hold on. You have your 21 motion in front of you? 22 MR. BUIKEMA: I do, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Now, I think page four. 24 MR. BUIKEMA: Yes.

10-10978; American University of Antigua v. Steven Woodward

THE COURT: At the bottom.

25

1 MR. BUIKEMA: Yes. 2 THE COURT: You set forth what the Act requires, fair enough? 3 4 MR. BUIKEMA: Yes. THE COURT: "Cause of action against a person who 5 6 uses in commerce any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, 7 or colorable imitation of a registered mark in 8 connection with a sale, offering for sale, distribution or advertisement of any goods or services." How is 9 10 that involved here? 11 MR. BUIKEMA: My understanding from the case law, Your Honor, is that so long as there is an attempt for 12 13 pecuniary gain --**THE COURT:** Do you have a case that supports that? 14 Because you don't cite it and I don't know of any. 15 16 MR. BUIKEMA: I believe that's given by the Walt 17 Disney Corp. case but I would have to go back and look, 18 Your Honor, to be sure. THE COURT: Counsel, you prepared this brief. 19 Ιt clearly says, "Goods or services." 20 21 Now, you don't come in and argue and say, "Okay, 22 well, Judge, that's what it says, let me tell you how 23 it applies." I mean, why is he using the Lanham Act 24 because in all my experience it involves goods or 25 services?

1	MR. BUIKEMA: Your Honor, the confusion of the
2	origin of the remarks I think is essential to the
3	Lanham Act. That there be an intention or purpose for
4	financial gain is, I think, a secondary prong under the
5	Lanham Act analysis.
6	THE COURT: Where? It says specifically, you
7	quoted it, "In connection with the sale of goods or
8	services."
9	MR. BUIKEMA: And Your Honor, with all due
10	respect, this is one factor of several, none of which
11	is dispositive.
12	THE COURT: What do you mean, "One factor"?
13	MR. BUIKEMA: And this is given by the Wynn Oil
14	Company versus Thomas case.
15	THE COURT: What do you mean, "One factor"?
16	MR. BUIKEMA: It's one factor of the likelihood of
17	confusion, we examine eight factors
18	THE COURT: Likelihood of confusion in connection
19	with the sale of goods or services, that's what it
20	says.
21	MR. BUIKEMA: All right.
22	THE COURT: So, I'm trying to figure out why are
23	you using this as a violation?
24	MR. BUIKEMA: Because Your Honor, the provision
25	(d), under the anticybersquatting

Wait, that's a different theory. 1 THE COURT: 2 MR. BUIKEMA: You asked me specifically about the 3 confusing --We're going to go to each one of your 4 theories because I'm trying to figure out why you're 5 asserting these theories because it doesn't seem to me 6 7 your Lanham Act has any merit at all. 8 MR. BUIKEMA: The Lanham Act claim is relative not to the use of the confusingly similar web domain name, 9 10 I misunderstood, Your Honor, apologies. 11 The Lanham Act claim is relative to plaintiff's use, republication of our actual logo, trade name. 12 13 **THE COURT:** Where is that set forth here? MR. BUIKEMA: This is set forth in the verified 14 15 complaint. 16 THE COURT: No, no, I've got your motion. 17 reading your motion. Your motion tells me why you're 18 entitled to relief. Now, you're coming up with something I didn't read in the motion at all. 19 That is contained, I believe, at 2.0 MR. BUIKEMA: 21 page six, Your Honor -- excuse me, top of page seven. Our motion reads, "Defendant's use of the similar 22 23 domain name, including copies, reproduction and/or 24 counterfeits of the AUA logo on the site itself has 25 been and continues to be done with the intent to cause

confusion, mistake, or harm as to the source or sponsorship of the information disseminated."

That's a factual predicate that's given by a verified complaint attached as Exhibit "A".

THE COURT: I understand. But I still think we have to go back to what you said the Lanham Act involves goods or services.

MR. BUIKEMA: For confusion as to origin of the goods and services. The goods and services here is the education being offered by my client.

If he is confusing the origin of the public remarks as to that good and service, that's a violation of the Lanham Act. He doesn't have to be attempting to sell competing goods or services. He simply has to be confusing the origin of the goods or services for sale which, in this case, is a medical school education.

And in his use of logos, that are our actual logos, he's violated the Lanham Act by republishing information as if it were published by my client.

THE COURT: What information did he republish as if it were by your client?

MR. BUIKEMA: Specifically if you go to the website, Your Honor, you'll find under a number of links, specifically under the document links or quote, unquote, "Evidence", under the website. This semester

2.0

syllabus, course guidelines, self-exams, publications or republications from University materials.

Now, incidentally, his republications violates a copyright as well but we've not alleged that. They are materials generated by my client. But they actually employ the AUA logo on this cite that contains, hand-in-hand, false and defamatory and damaging information.

THE COURT: We'll get to the false and defamatory, don't mix up all your claims.

MR. BUIKEMA: It's important to me, Your Honor, because when you bring those things hand in hand you have given credibility to the offending information.

So, whereas republishing the course syllabus with its logo is not, in and of itself, damaging to my client's reputation, it is, in fact, the course syllabus.

When you employ that logo and attach it to your website as if that website is somehow connected with or sponsored by the University, you have given credibility or caused confusion as to the source of the remaining remarks.

THE COURT: I don't know how that's a violation of the Lanham Act. The Lanham Act really deals with goods and services and normally it's competing.

Let's go to your next argument which is 1 2 anticybersquatting claim? 3 MR. BUIKEMA: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Tell me about that one. 4 5 MR. BUIKEMA: Okay. The defendant's website 6 utilizes as a domain name "aua-med.org" -- or excuse me, "aua-med.com". 7 8 The actual and authentic website is, "auamed.org". 9 That website -- domain name is not chosen by accident, 10 I submit to you, it's chosen for the very purpose of 11 ciphering off legitimate internet traffic for seeking information about the University or potentially from 12 13 the University to be redirected to Mr. Woodward's site. Because he has chosen that trade name under this 14 15 provision of the ACPA, he can be held liable and injunctive relief is available if, in fact, there is 16 17 bad faith intent to profit from that mark or use that 18 mark and it's confusingly similar or diluted. 19 THE COURT: All right. Let's go to page seven of 2.0 your brief, your motion. 21 MR. BUIKEMA: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: You said, "Cyber squatting involves a 22 23 registration as a domain, names of well-known 24 trademarks by a non-trademark holder who then try to 25 sell names back to the trademark."

1	MR. BUIKEMA: That is one potential
2	THE COURT: That isn't happening here, is it?
3	MR. BUIKEMA: It's not. I agree. But that's one
4	potential means or method of violating the ACPA, as I
5	understand it.
6	THE COURT: Let's keep going. It says, "A person
7	shall be liable in a civil action by the owner of a
8	markif without regard to the goods or services of
9	the parties." Again, we're talking about goods and
10	services.
11	MR. BUIKEMA: Your Honor, I agree. But the goods
12	and services is not focusing from the offender
13	standpoint. The offender doesn't have to be selling or
14	advertising competing goods or services for it to be a
15	violation.
16	THE COURT: Who says they don't? What case do you
17	have that says, "The competitor doesn't have to be
18	involved in selling goods or services", what case?
19	Every case I've ever had, the competitor is
20	dealing with goods or services.
21	MR. BUIKEMA: He is competing with us
22	THE COURT: Everyone I've had is dealing with
23	goods or services, that's what the competition is
24	doing.
25	MR. BUIKEMA: In my view, Your Honor, the goods or

services are the domain name itself and the information 1 2 disclosed thereby. 3 THE COURT: He's not trying to sell the name itself, is he? 4 MR. BUIKEMA: I don't know. 5 6 THE COURT: Wait. It's your motion, if you don't 7 know, then you can't say that he is. 8 MR. BUIKEMA: That's correct, Your Honor, there's 9 been no discovery in this case. 10 And as you know, I'm held to a standard of potential success on the merits. Substantial 11 likelihood of success on the merits, not absolute 12 13 success on the merits. There's been no discovery on that issue. 14 15 I will submit to you, Your Honor, that it's my belief and understanding, I was not counsel in the 16 17 State Court case. But my belief and understanding is 18 that Mr. Woodward has attempted to extract profit from, let's say, exploited aspects of that web domain. 19 THE COURT: What's the basis of that 2.0 21 understanding? 22 MR. BUIKEMA: From my review of the record, I am 23 appellate counsel in that case and was so appointed 24 after the disposition by the State Court Judge. 25 THE COURT: All right. Let's go to your next

claim which is, "Willful violation of Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act"?

MR. BUIKEMA: Correct.

2.0

THE COURT: I'm reading from your brief, "The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 prohibits the federal funding of educational institutions that have a policy of practice of releasing education records without authorized persons." What's that got to do with this case?

MR. BUIKEMA: In my view, Your Honor, it's a wrongful act predicate to a tortious interference claim. And perhaps that's not made as clear as it should be by our pleadings but that's how I regard this claim.

FERPA prohibits disclosures of students' information by the University itself. And has, as consequence, the termination of federal funding, which my client does receive and some of the students receive benefits under that provision.

It's my view that Mr. Woodward's conduct in disclosing student information grades, which he admits to doing and, in fact, has muddied this record by attaching yet more of that information, creates standing to my client -- gives standing to my client the challenge on behalf of its students.

1	But more importantly
2	THE COURT: Why, he's not an agent of the
3	university in any way, shape or form?
4	MR. BUIKEMA: But we are an agent of our students
5	whose information has been
6	THE COURT: But this prohibits the University from
7	doing it. How could you possibly argue that the
8	University is doing it, when they're not?
9	MR. BUIKEMA: I'm not sure I understand Your
10	Honor's question.
11	THE COURT: It says, "It prohibits federal funding
12	of educational institutions who have a policy or
13	practice." You don't contend the education has a
14	policy or practice, do you?
15	MR. BUIKEMA: I do not contend that it has a
16	policy or practice. But Mr. Woodward's actions in
17	disclosing the student information could cause the
18	federal government to terminate funding
19	THE COURT: How could that be a policy or practice
20	of the University? How would anyone ever believe his
21	conduct is a practice or policy of the University?
22	MR. BUIKEMA: I'd rather not find out, frankly,
23	Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: It's just ridiculous. I don't know
25	why you're arguing that. His conduct can't be

2.0

considered a policy or practice of the University. You said that from the very beginning, it's not. I don't know why you're arguing these claims that have very little, if any, merit.

And the problem is you can -- obviously, an attorney can argue alternate theories, but you've got to have some basis for the alternate theory or what happens is, the Court says, "Wow, he's just throwing everything in there so if they're weak, all his claims must be equally weak."

And it's just a bad practice, in my judgment, to assert any claim unless you have solid evidence that there's at least some good merit to it and I don't think there's any merit to this claim at all.

MR. BUIKEMA: Again, Your Honor, I think my pleadings are confusing in that regard and I'm not intending to argue to this Court that there is an independent clause of action that exist in my client because of FERPA.

What I'm arguing is that Mr. Woodward's publication of private student information which would be violative of FERPA is a tortious interference with a third-party expectancy --

THE COURT: It's not tortious interference.

MR. BUIKEMA: -- because the federal funding

consequence of release of that information is 1 2 potentially damaging to my client and its students. 3 THE COURT: And it's a policy and practice of the University that's to be dealt with, not some person 4 that's acting as you allege he is. 5 6 Any event, let's go to the next one. 7 MR. BUIKEMA: Go ahead. 8 THE COURT: You've got a defamation claim? 9 MR. BUIKEMA: I do, Your Honor. 10 And if you take any time to peruse Mr. Woodward's 11 website this is a lot more than a gripe site. A lot more than expression of opinions as is given in the 12 13 evidence before you, specifically the verified complaint and my written pleadings in this regard. 14 15 He accuses the University of conspiratorial conduct, the defrauding of students, of falsifying 16 17 students' grades, the connection with criminal 18 activities and the like. 19 THE COURT: Let's take them one at a time, okay. MR. BUIKEMA: Fair enough. 2.0 21 **THE COURT:** Are they listed on page two? 22 these the defamation statements or whatever you're 23 calling them? 24 MR. BUIKEMA: That's a summary. 25

10-10978; American University of Antigua v. Steven Woodward

**THE COURT:** You say, "A summary"?

1	MR. BUIKEMA: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Well, I'm trying to ask you whether
3	these are listed, "A", "B", are these specific?
4	MR. BUIKEMA: They're not in every instance the
5	words used, but they are words that are used in summary
6	of different links within the website that connote this
7	information.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Now, he says you say he
9	says, I'm now on page two listing the items there
10	starting with small "a".
11	MR. BUIKEMA: Okay.
12	THE COURT: You say he says, "AUA routinely
13	commits fraud upon its students"?
14	MR. BUIKEMA: Yes.
15	THE COURT: I don't have any information from you
16	that they don't.
17	MR. BUIKEMA: I'm sorry?
18	THE COURT: I don't have any information that's
19	false.
20	MR. BUIKEMA: Yes, you do, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Where?
22	MR. BUIKEMA: Exhibit "A" is a verified complaint
23	which, as part of the allegations says
24	THE COURT: Hold on.
25	MR. BUIKEMA: "We've reviewed all of these and the

allegations in our complaint are true", and it's signed 1 2 by the President of the University. 3 THE COURT: Hold on. MR. BUIKEMA: In fact, that's the only evidence 4 you have, in this case, thus far. 5 THE COURT: Hold on. Tell me what the verified 6 7 complaint says with respect to these individual items. 8 MR. BUIKEMA: I will. 9 If you look at page four of the verified 10 complaint, paragraph 21, Your Honor, reads: "Defendant's website represents, alleges, and 11 publishes, as if true, false and defamatory about AUA, 12 13 including by way of example and not by limitation 14 that:" 15 And then you see the same subparagraphs "A" through "P" in that allegation. 16 17 The very last page, of course, is a verification 18 signed, under oath, by the President of the University indicating that the allegations contained in the 19 complaint are, in fact, true. He's reviewed them and 2.0 21 the like. 22 So, he's affirmed that those representations by 23 Mr. Woodward's website are false in sworn testimony. 24 THE COURT: Who signed the affidavit? 25 MR. WOODWARD: The President of the University.

His name is Neil Simon, not to be confused with the 1 2 playwright. 3 Let's go, for example, to small "h": "AUA students are sexually assaulted." Is that a false 4 5 statement? In and of itself, an AUA student was 6 MR. BUIKEMA: 7 apparently assaulted. The connotation of AUA students 8 being sexually assaulted, in the tense, is a false 9 statement. 10 **THE COURT:** In the what? 11 MR. BUIKEMA: In the tense utilized or represented by the website is a false statement. 12 13 THE COURT: I'm missing what you're talking about, "Tense". 14 15 MR. BUIKEMA: The statement in the website 16 connotes a general practice or happening as if "All 17 students" or generally students are sexually assaulted 18 at AUA. THE COURT: That's the spin you put on it. 19 the statement itself is true, "AUA students are 2.0 21 sexually assaulted", have they? 22 MR. BUIKEMA: An AUA student was sexually 23 assaulted. 24 THE COURT: Only one? 25 MR. BUIKEMA: To my knowledge, yes.

1	THE COURT: Next one, AUA's professors teach
2	students wrong information. How does the President
3	know that's not true?
4	MR. BUIKEMA: Because he's responsible for
5	generating a curriculum and overseeing the curriculum.
6	THE COURT: Does he know what every professor is
7	saying in class?
8	MR. BUIKEMA: He signed the affidavit based upon
9	his firsthand knowledge and review of the facts to the
10	best of his knowledge, information, and belief, Your
11	Honor.
12	THE COURT: Let's go to page three, paragraph "l":
13	"AUA students pass rate for USMLE medical board exams
14	is only 22.9%."
15	MR. BUIKEMA: Yes.
16	THE COURT: That's false?
17	MR. BUIKEMA: That's absolutely false. The
18	passage rate is approximately 80 percent or better.
19	USMLE scores are not published by Universities or
20	institutions to begin with. So, there's no way for Mr.
21	Woodward to make that representation in the first
22	place. It's reckless.
23	USMLE scores are published by location. And if
24	you fair it out, that allegation in Mr. Woodward's
25	website, by clicking on the appropriate links, you'll

2.0

go through his purported evidence and video evidence of this, which is a Power Point presentation that doesn't even mention the USMLE scores.

And even if you look at non-U.S., Canada, the statistics published on Mr. Woodward's own website in support of this proposition, this lie, they show Canada, non-U.S. USMLE scores in the 70 percent to 85 percent range. It's absolutely false.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything further?

MR. BUIKEMA: Yes, Your Honor. Because I think it's most sensitive from when you're looking at a defamation case, there are a litany of examples that if the Court took the time to review the website, the Court would see are more definite statements of falsehood and defamatory remarks.

A couple that I'd like to point out are, in one portion of his website Mr. Woodward indicates or claims that, as if fact, that AUA has disregard for basic civil rights and in support of video, cites the 5th Amendment and says that we've denied the student a right to produce evidence at a fair hearing.

First of all, the 5th Amendment doesn't apply to my client. But having said that, the statement that his civil rights were somehow violated are derived apparently from his belief that he was entitled to the

2.0

same by some hearing he failed to attempt and that's supported by the verified complaint.

Most notably to me is in the video index section of his website, Mr. Woodward states, "Antigua Crimes and AUA". That's the topic of the category, Antigua Crimes and AUA. And then says, quote, "Learn the truth about AUA's lies and connections with criminal activities on Antigua."

He has directly accused, as if fact, my client of being tied to criminal activity on the Island of Antigua. There's absolutely no support for that proposition. That proposition is false. That proposition is per se defamatory.

And for those reasons and our reasons in our written pleadings, I believe that preliminary injunction, during the pendency of this case, and just until such time as this case can be heard on all of its merits, is appropriate in this circumstance.

My client suffers harm everyday it continues to be up that these lies are published with confusingly similar domain names and confusion as to origin, including use of its own logos, copyright protected information, student's grades and the like.

And for those reasons, Your Honor, I ask you to grant our motion.

1	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Woodward.
2	MR. WOODWARD: Can I present evidence today, Your
3	Honor?
4	THE COURT: I don't know how long you're going to
5	take to do it?
6	MR. WOODWARD: Can I step back and get my box of
7	evidence?
8	THE COURT: Sure.
9	MR. WOODWARD: Do I have to come here?
10	THE COURT: You can stay there.
11	RESPONSE BY MR. WOODWARD
12	MR. WOODWARD: First off, Your Honor, I think he
13	talked about cyber squatting. And I believe under 15
14	U.S the code for cyber squatting, there's an
15	exemption for that and that would be for people it's
16	15, 1125, page 3, it's an exclusion A (ii), B and C for
17	people that are not for criticizing news, et cetera,
18	are just people expressing their civil rights of
19	freedom of speech.
20	THE COURT: That's why you're supposed to file a
21	response in writing saying that. You would have
22	alerted the Court this is your basis. I could have
23	looked at it.
24	MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor
25	THE COURT: I'm not going to look at it now,

1	you're supposed to give it to me ahead of time.
2	MR. WOODWARD: I emailed this but it wasn't
3	formatted properly to the I emailed this to
4	Ms. Orem. This rebuttal was emailed to her.
5	THE COURT: Just brief, I don't want a rambling
6	thing. Did you say that in the email, just now what
7	you told me?
8	MR. WOODWARD: That is in the file that I attached
9	to Ms. Orem, but not to this file that's here. It's
10	attached to one of the files that I sent her before I
11	received the entire motion from this attorney.
12	THE COURT: Okay. What's next?
13	MR. WOODWARD: Okay. Document, bad faith. Okay.
14	Your Honor, as far as bad faith, again, under the
15	evidence of registry and use of bad faith,
16	circumstances, limitations found, the first one is for
17	purposes of selling and renting. I do not sell or rent
18	anything.
19	THE COURT: What are you talking about? Where are
20	you?
21	MR. WOODWARD: I'm just trying to follow where
22	he
23	THE COURT: Then tell me what item you're on, I
24	don't know where you are?
25	MR. WOODWARD: The subject of bad faith of having

1	my domain name, sir.
2	THE COURT: Where do you find he's claiming bad
3	faith?
4	MR. WOODWARD: That would be on the Your Honor,
5	that would be it's not part of cyber squat. It's
6	part of the ICANN policies, part of ICANN policies for
7	the use of domain names.
8	THE COURT: What part of his motion are you
9	responding to at this point?
10	MR. WOODWARD: The use of my website, aua-med.com.
11	THE COURT: Pull the motion out. He's got section
12	by section. He talked about it when he argued. He
13	took one step at a time. I don't know what you're
14	talking about.
15	MR. WOODWARD: This is I put a reference in
16	here, it's the ICANN document and it's the policy of
17	ICANN.
18	THE COURT: I don't know what ICANN have to do
19	with anything. What's an ICANN? Where is that
20	mentioned in his motion?
21	MR. WOODWARD: Well, Your Honor, ICANN is the
22	organization the international organization that's
23	responsible for domain names.
24	THE COURT: Okay. So?
25	MR. WOODWARD: And as far as bad faith policy for

1	those, I'm not in violation of any of their policies
2	THE COURT: Who say you were? Where did he say
3	you're in violation of ICANN? Where did he mention it?
4	MR. WOODWARD: He just said I was in violation of
5	bad faith of using my domain name.
6	THE COURT: Well, which one of the arguments, he
7	gave four basis?
8	MR. WOODWARD: Oh, sorry, Your Honor. The
9	argument of bad faith. Number 41, sir, "Defendant
10	has"
11	THE COURT: Time out. Number 41 of what?
12	MR. WOODWARD: Forty-one of his complaint.
13	THE COURT: Page number?
14	MR. WOODWARD: Sorry, it's page eight, sir, number
15	41.
16	THE COURT: Hold on.
17	MR. WOODWARD: Yes, sir.
18	THE COURT: Are you on the motion brief?
19	MR. WOODWARD: This is the complaint that he
20	filed.
21	THE COURT: Oh, you're talking about the
22	complaint?
23	MR. WOODWARD: Isn't that what we're going
24	through, Your Honor?
25	THE COURT: No, I'm going through his motion for

1	preliminary injunction.
2	MR. WOODWARD: Aren't they one in the same, these
3	motions?
4	THE COURT: No, absolutely not. That's what I was
5	going through paragraph by paragraph of the motion.
6	MR. WOODWARD: Okay. The motion I only had five
7	lined items, I thought, on this motion.
8	THE COURT: You have a copy of the motion?
9	MR. WOODWARD: I have this document right here,
10	Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: What's it called?
12	MR. WOODWARD: It's called, "Plaintiff's Motion
13	for Preliminary Injunction", and there's three pages to
14	it.
15	THE COURT: Three?
16	MR. WOODWARD: This is what I thought I had to
17	defend today. I didn't know that I had to defend this
18	entire paper.
19	THE COURT: Hold on. Show that to him.
20	MR. WOODWARD: Is this it?
21	MR. BUIKEMA: That's the motion, Your Honor,
22	that's not the brief and exhibits. And I have proof of
23	service for all of them.
24	MR. WOODWARD: I thought that the other part was
25	this.

1	THE COURT: Hold on. Just hold on.
2	Counsel, I have a document entitled, "Plaintiff's
3	Motion for Preliminary Injunction", okay. And then
4	attached to it the Plaintiff's brief, fair enough? Did
5	you not get the brief?
6	MR. WOODWARD: I assumed that the brief was this.
7	THE COURT: Don't assume anything. Did you get
8	MR. WOODWARD: I did, Your Honor, I thought this
9	is what we were going over today, these five items.
10	THE COURT: What does the brief say? What's the
11	title of it in front of you, the brief?
12	MR. WOODWARD: Oh, I didn't even print it because
13	it was the same as this.
14	THE COURT: What's, "This"?
15	MR. WOODWARD: This is his claim that he sent me.
16	This is the Plaintiff's Verified Complaint for Request
17	for Temporary Restraining Order?
18	MR. BUIKEMA: He appears to be holding up the
19	complaint which is Exhibit "A" to our brief. But
20	that's certainly not the same of what we're dealing
21	with today, of course.
22	THE COURT: I'm going by the brief in support of
23	the motion, that's what we're here for today. That's
24	what I wanted you to respond to, the arguments made in
25	the motion.

1	MR. WOODWARD: Okay. I was confused that this
2	first page was a motion and there are five items to
3	this page and that's why I wasn't
4	THE COURT: I don't know of any motion talking
5	about bad faith. In any event, let's go on.
6	MR. WOODWARD: We just covered bad faith in his
7	THE COURT: I understand. I don't know that you
8	have bad faith or not.
9	MR. WOODWARD: Yes, Your Honor.
10	As far as yes, Your Honor. I guess I can go
11	over my claims here that are obviously I can show
12	that they are mistaken.
13	When it says, "AUA student rate for USMLE medical
14	board is only 22.9% percent", that is not what my
15	website says and I have evidence to show that.
16	What it is, it's Antigua does. And it's published
17	information. There's two medical schools on Antigua.
18	And Antigua has a 22.9% pass rate. Antigua does.
19	THE COURT: Hold on. What's the difference
20	between Antigua?
21	MR. WOODWARD: There are two medical schools, Your
22	Honor. The organizations that release or that have the
23	documentation to support the pass rates will not
24	release those pass scores.
25	THE COURT: So, you never stated that this

University has a --1 2 MR. WOODWARD: No. THE COURT: You never said it? 3 MR. WOODWARD: Never said it. 4 5 THE COURT: Stop. Stop. Counsel, why do you say he said it? 6 7 RESPONSE BY MR. BUIKEMA 8 MR. BUIKEMA: That's my understanding of the 9 website publication. 10 And even if what Mr. Woodward is now saying is true, he's just told you, Your Honor, that there are 11 two medical schools. And so to say that Antiqua's 12 13 USMLE rate in context to his entire web page that's smearing the reputation of my client, was intentionally 14 15 misleading and known to be misleading by this person. He's also just said the organization that 16 17 publishes those scores won't release them. So, how can 18 he know the pass rate from Antigua if he sought that from the releasing party and they won't release it? 19 That's a reckless statement. Whether it's intentional 2.0 21 or not, if it's reckless, that supports the cause for 22 defamation. 23 Why are you making any reference at

10-10978; American University of Antigua v. Steven Woodward

all about a pass rate of 22.9%?

RESPONSE BY MR. WOODWARD

24

25

1	MR. WOODWARD: Because it was published in the
2	newspaper, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: What's that got to do with this
4	school?
5	MR. WOODWARD: Because there are two schools on
6	the Island of Antigua, one has a 90% USMLE pass rate
7	for first time test-taking students; another one claims
8	that they have an 80.6% pass rate. 80.6 and 90%
9	doesn't equal 22.9%.
10	MR. BUIKEMA: I couldn't agree more, Your Honor.
11	And Mr. Woodward knows that when he publishes that
12	false statistic.
13	THE COURT: What's the 22.9% got to do with this
14	University?
15	MR. WOODWARD: I don't just talk about this
16	University, Your Honor, on my website.
17	THE COURT: Well, the primary thing on your
18	website is about this University, isn't it?
19	MR. WOODWARD: That's right, Your Honor. But the
20	ECFMG, which is the governing body for these types of
21	organizations down in the Caribbean, will not release
22	that information, even though I've requested it.
23	THE COURT: I'm not concerned about information
24	that isn't released. I'm concerned about you making
25	the statement that at least, by some inference, since

1	your website is dealing with this University and you
2	talk about a pass rate of 22.9%, someone might say,
3	"Wow".
4	MR. WOODWARD: That's correct, Your Honor, and
5	that's where I go to the data that was released in a
6	Power Point presentation from the school showed that
7	the University only had about a 50 percent pass rate.
8	When I further looked at that information, I found
9	out that for AUA students only, the pass rate was only
10	44%, that's not transfer students, that's just the
11	students that started and ended with AUA. And that was
12	inside the Power Point presentation, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Why talk about 22.9%
14	MR. WOODWARD: I mean 44% pass rate.
15	THE COURT: Why talk about 22.9%?
16	MR. WOODWARD: Because it demonstrates, Your
17	Honor, that somebody's not telling the truth.
18	THE COURT: A statement that the pass rate for
19	medical board exam of 22.9% tell us somebody is not
20	telling the truth?
21	MR. WOODWARD: If there's only two universities on
22	the island, Your Honor, and the total pass rate for the
23	island is 22.9% and one school claims a 90% pass rate
24	and the other school an 80.6% pass rate

THE COURT: That doesn't mean this defendant did

25

anything wrong. You're aligning this university with 1 2 no basis for it. MR. WOODWARD: No, Your Honor, because I further 3 4 go on to explain that the pass rate, per their release student information, is 44%, Your Honor, not 80.6% like 5 6 they claim on their website. 7 THE COURT: But you said --8 MR. WOODWARD: I did not demonstrate anywhere on 9 that island, I'm just saying that the numbers just 10 don't add up. 11 THE COURT: But be fair. You're attacking this University, people will read this and think you're 12 13 talking about this university. MR. WOODWARD: No, I also talk about the other 14 15 university. I talk about the hospital. I talk about 16 the ECFMG not releasing student grades so that people 17 know what kind of university they're getting into, Your 18 Honor. 19 THE COURT: What's your --20 MR. WOODWARD: The hospitals that they deal with 21 and the businesses that they deal with, that's on the 22 front cover of my page. 23 **THE COURT:** In his brief in support of the motion, 24 he lists what they believe are false statements by you. 25 And number "A" is: "AUA routinely commits fraud upon

its students." What's the basis for that? 1 2 MR. WOODWARD: Well, I don't know the basis for 3 routinely commits fraud, Your Honor. But on the documentation that I just turned in 4 today, Your Honor, as far as all of the -- that 5 contained all of the student information that was 6 7 released, I can demonstrate that I earned an 80 percent 8 on my final grade and AUA gave me an "F". THE COURT: Hold on. One thing to say you believe 9 10 you were. Counsel, why do you say in here: "AUA routinely 11 commits fraud"? Does he say that on the website? 12 13 RESPONSE BY MR. BUIKEMA MR. BUIKEMA: I do say that and he does say that. 14 15 And the home page says, "You'll find evidence of fraud. Contains evidence of AUA committing fraud." 16 17 If you click on the link and then either the 18 evidence links or the video links to these Youtube videos which, by the way, are narrated by Mr. Woodward 19 and published by Mr. Woodward as well. He goes through 20 21 these synopsis of how AUA commits fraud upon its 22 "Students", plural. And it's about an eight-minute video, I think, in that particular circumstance. 23 24 And the characterization of my motion is an

25

accurate characterization of his website from us and

publications.

2.0

### RESPONSE BY MR. WOODWARD

MR. WOODWARD: If the data is not released and you have the student grades that the school reported to me on their Power Point presentation that their grades are only 50% and on the internet they're claiming an 80.6% pass rate, they're not telling the truth. That's false advertisement.

If they give a person an "F" on their final grade that earned an 80 percent on their final grade, that's fraud, as far as the definition of cheating a student.

They further went on to say, "Failed final exam.

Did not have OP rotation." That is also fraud, Your

Honor. I had an out-patient rotation. I only had two
clinical rotations --

THE COURT: Let's stay away from you, I understand you. On what basis do you conclude whatever happened to you happens to other students?

MR. WOODWARD: Because, Your Honor, we were supposed to have clinical rotations and more than just two rotations. All of these students only had two rotations.

They claimed superior, quality education, et cetera. If you look at this semester program, we had over 20 changes in the schedule of this semester

program, Your Honor. The applications that they had didn't even work, Your Honor. The testing applications did not work. The testing applications failed.

There was a week time, Your Honor, when I couldn't do any of my work for the testing application because it did not work. Five days, Your Honor, that their application didn't work.

That would be like your employees not being able to do their work for five days. And I paid \$12,000 for this education that is supposedly this quality, great education. And instead they give me an "F".

THE COURT: One thing to complain about the way you were treated, okay. I'm more concerned about you making generalized statements about other students, without any basis for it.

MR. WOODWARD: I am a student. I was a student.

THE COURT: "Other students", okay. It's one thing to express complaints about the way you were treated, but to go on and generally suggest that this is happening to all kinds of students may be inaccurate.

MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor, in my experience it is not because I've just demonstrated that they say on their website about the quality of education and I just gave you an example about the quality education we get,

its not quality education. 1 2 THE COURT: That's your opinion. "AUA students--", says, you say, "--are sexually 3 assaulted." 4 5 MR. WOODWARD: An AUA student was sexually 6 assaulted, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Hold on. Is that what you said on 8 your website? 9 MR. WOODWARD: Yes. 10 THE COURT: Exactly one student was sexually 11 assaulted? MR. WOODWARD: I gave -- the article that's inside 12 13 this example right here, it's Exhibit No. 4, Your 14 Honor. 15 I showed this one example and I explained and read this one exhibit from Antiqua. I believe it's from the 16 17 Antigua Sun, Your Honor, that showed that an AUA 18 student was sexually assaulted. I compared that, Your Honor, to an AUA claim as 19 located on a vibrant and modern twin island state of 20 21 Antigua. Antigua's ideal location for study. 22 secure for studying. Antiqua provides students with the most modern comforts, familiar lifestyle in a 23 24 stable and safe environment. 25 I compared this to that and other exhibits that

1	show that there is a huge problem on the island. That
2	the government officials on the island recognize it's a
3	problem.
4	And I'd like you to look at Exhibit 3 that I have
5	here where, "Murder sex offenses top police
6	statistics." This is December 31st of 2009.
7	And that's totally in contrast to their claims of
8	a stable and safe environment.
9	THE COURT: Well, I don't know that that's
10	necessarily true. As you well know students,
11	unfortunately, have been sexually assaulted at a number
12	of universities in Michigan. That doesn't mean that
13	Ann Arbor or East Lansing is a crime ridden environment
14	because on occasion a student has been molested.
15	MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor, I just post information
16	from the news articles.
17	THE COURT: Yeah, but you're trying to convey that
18	this is an unsafe place.
19	MR. WOODWARD: No, Your Honor, what I'm doing is
20	THE COURT: You're not?
21	MR. WOODWARD: I'm comparing what they write on
22	their website
23	THE COURT: Aren't you trying to convey that it's
24	an unsafe place?
25	MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor, it is an unsafe place,

1	in my opinion.
2	THE COURT: That's what you're trying to convey,
3	isn't it?
4	MR. WOODWARD: It is. And it's totally different
5	than what they state on their web pages, which what I'm
6	trying to convey. Which is what they state on their
7	web pages is not true. It's not as true as like they
8	would like to lead you to believe.
9	They would like to lead you to believe in these
10	pictures that it's all sandy beaches and warm sun and
11	you're going to come down and nothing is going to
12	happen to you.
13	THE COURT: They say in here that your website
14	says that: "AUA disregards student's civil rights",
15	did you say that?
16	MR. WOODWARD: Disregard for civil rights, yes,
17	Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: What's the basis for that?
19	MR. WOODWARD: The basis for that on the first
20	committee meeting they had against me was a tit for
21	tat.
22	I claimed that one of the professors, Your Honor,
23	and I have the documentation for this, was
24	confrontational to the students and I initiated a
25	grievance committee against the school. The school, in

return, initiated a grievance committee against me for 1 2 this and the professor claimed that I was rude to her during her presentation of the class, it was a test 3 review. 4 5 And I had the video -- I had the audiotape of that entire conversation, Your Honor. The audiotape of the 6 7 entire class. And during the committee meeting, I was 8 not allowed to present that as evidence. 9 THE COURT: That applies to you. 10 MR. WOODWARD: Right. 11 THE COURT: Well, I'm concerned that you're not saying that on the website. 12 13 MR. WOODWARD: Another student was also implicated in the same committee meeting, Your Honor, that's two 14 15 of us. 16 THE COURT: How can you say they conspired against 17 the other student? 18 MR. WOODWARD: That's not a conspiracy, that's the 19 committee meeting. Civil rights. 20 THE COURT: How do you know that? 21 MR. WOODWARD: I could hear them yelling at him 22 through the door, Your Honor. I'm sitting outside the door of this committee meeting and hear them talking to 23 24 this individual outside the door.

10-10978; American University of Antigua v. Steven Woodward

Okay. Another example, Your Honor, is they tried

25

to initiate another committee meeting against me during 1 2 final week and during that they wouldn't even give me 3 what it was for. I have emails where I'm requesting, "What did I 4 Please, explain what and when I did something?" 5 6 They never gave me that information, Your Honor, never. 7 And that committee meeting was dropped. 8 During this committee meeting that I had in 9 December of 2007, they denied me the right to counsel 10 even though per their student handbook it says that I have the right to evidence and counsel. 11 THE COURT: Okay. My concern is this, it's one 12 13 thing for you to express your dissatisfaction about the 14 way you were treated, okay. 15 But it's not necessarily fair for you to 16 generalize and suggest that what's happening to you is 17 happening to everyone. You agree with me? 18 MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor, it happened to me and another student --19 2.0 THE COURT: Do you agree that it would be wrong to 21 say that, "What happened to me, happens to all the 22 students", wouldn't that be wrong? 23 MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor, I've seen this school. 24 I've seen --25 THE COURT: Wouldn't it be wrong to say that,

1	"What happened to me, happens to all the students",
2	wouldn't that be wrong?
3	MR. WOODWARD: Not when you witness it happening?
4	THE COURT: To all the students?
5	MR. WOODWARD: I never said, "All the students".
6	THE COURT: Wouldn't it be wrong to make that
7	statement?
8	MR. WOODWARD: If you say, "Every single student
9	this happens to"
10	THE COURT: I'm not saying, "Every single
11	student".
12	Wouldn't it be wrong to say that, "What happened
13	to me, happens to all the students", wouldn't that be
14	wrong?
15	MR. WOODWARD: How many students need to be
16	destroyed at that place?
17	THE COURT: Wouldn't that be a wrong statement?
18	MR. WOODWARD: If you had said, "Everybody", yes.
19	THE COURT: I said, "All the students", yes, okay.
20	Now, if you said, "What's happened to me, happens
21	to other students", do you have proof of all that?
22	MR. WOODWARD: I have proof that there's a
23	committee meeting issued against me and the other
24	student, that first committee meeting when it was over
25	that tit for tat thing, and they didn't let me produce

the evidence and they obviously didn't let him. 1 2 THE COURT: Obviously? MR. WOODWARD: Well, I have the evidence to clear 3 both of us and they didn't allow me to produce it and 4 5 he didn't have it. I had the computer with me, I had 6 the evidence. I was not allowed to produce it. They claim you say: "AUA conspires 7 THE COURT: 8 against its students." 9 MR. WOODWARD: That's right, Your Honor. I have 10 documentation evidence, Your Honor, that shows that we 11 were given pagers at St. Joseph Mercy Hospital, Your Honor, this is just another example. 12 13 We were given pagers September at St. Joseph Mercy Hospital. Pagers were not part of any of the syllabus, 14 15 course guidelines, no documentation of the use of 16 pagers, okay. 17 In October, supposedly, Susan Zonia, the director 18 of the program, paged me on a Friday after one o'clock, 19 at two o'clock it says in her email. She did it again 20 on Monday, which would have been at the end of the 21 program. The following week, Monday, she paged me 22 twice. And a committee meeting was written up against

Your Honor, at one o'clock I would have been excused per the schedule of the whole course. I was

me that I missed pages.

23

24

25

done. 1 2 THE COURT: What's that got to do with the 3 University conspiring against its "Students", plural? 4 What's that got to do with that? 5 MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor, this just demonstrates 6 how this has happened to me. 7 THE COURT: I think your website should say that. 8 Should limit your criticism to that which happened to 9 you, which you do know. 10 I'm not convinced you know about all the other 11 students and all the other things either. And I think you're generalizing, without any basis for it, based on 12 13 what happened to you. MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor, I just had so many 14 15 instances of this happen to me. I saw also, Bill 16 Stewart, another student that was run out. Again, I 17 quote this committee meeting that happened --18 THE COURT: You told me earlier you were leaving 19 to go some place soon? 2.0 MR. WOODWARD: Yes, Your Honor, I fly out tomorrow 21 at 5:50, Your Honor. THE COURT: Counsel indicated at the end of this 22 23 presentation that your statement, at least in his 24 opinion, implies that the school is responsible for 25 criminal acts?

1	MR. WOODWARD: Ties with criminal acts, yes, Your
2	Honor.
3	THE COURT: What's your basis for that?
4	MR. WOODWARD: There's a \$7 billion dollar
5	Stanford fraud scheme that's now currently in progress.
6	And matter of fact, there are websites, at least
7	one that I'm very familiar with, where people are
8	trying to get retribution from this fraud scam that
9	happened on Antigua. This is a Stanford fraud scam.
10	Widely publicized.
11	I forget what government officials were involved
12	on Antigua but I know it also implicated the Caribbean
13	Caucus, Your Honor.
14	The Caribbean Caucus, Your Honor, was chaired by
15	Donald Payne, Congressman Donald Payne out of New
16	Jersey, Your Honor. Donald Payne has done things for
17	this University, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Has what?
19	MR. WOODWARD: He's done things for this
20	THE COURT: For?
21	MR. WOODWARD: For the University he was the
22	keynote speaker and I believe was last year's keynote
23	speaker for the university.
24	And the last time I checked he was under
25	investigation for implications of changing laws or

prohibiting laws pertaining to this \$7 billion fraud 1 2 scam. 3 On top of that, Your Honor, if you look at the timeline between the foundation of American University 4 of Antigua, which is 2004 and 2006, Your Honor, I 5 believe it's 2006. 6 7 After 2004, Donald Payne spoke to congress 8 recognizing American University of Antiqua. shortly after that, American University of Antiqua got 9 10 their New York certification, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: What's that got to do with them being involved in criminal activity? 12 13 MR. WOODWARD: I don't say that they're involved, I say they have ties to criminal activity. 14 15 THE COURT: Ties, tell me about the ties. 16 MR. WOODWARD: It's the congressman and 17 congresswoman, actually Carol Kilpatrick in Michigan 18 that's involved with this \$7 billion dollar fraud scam 19 on Antiqua. 2.0 THE COURT: You don't see that as being very 21 reprehensible saying they're tied to criminal activity? 22 You don't know what their tie is at all. 23 MR. WOODWARD: Their tie is the congressman and 24 the actions that they have with that. 25 THE COURT: That's not criminal activity.

1	MR. WOODWARD: The \$7 billion dollar fraud scam
2	is.
3	THE COURT: Has that been proven?
4	MR. WOODWARD: That hasn't been proven. And I
5	don't state that I just say, "Here are ties to a
6	criminal activity."
7	THE COURT: Don't you think that's really
8	irresponsible to do that to somebody? No proof at all
9	that they're involved, not at all. And we're going to
10	paint them all with a black brush?
11	MR. WOODWARD: With everything else that has
12	happened to me on that island, Your Honor, I think it's
13	a very fair statement of them.
14	THE COURT: Well, you're just angry, okay.
15	MR. WOODWARD: I'm very angry, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Now, tell me what the harm is if you
17	take down the website 'till you get back?
18	MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor, if you take down my
19	website, first off, I have an appeal going concerning
20	this committee meeting in December of 2007 and
21	THE COURT: I'm sorry, appeal to whom?
22	MR. WOODWARD: To Oakland County Courts. It's
23	pertaining to me and the University, Your Honor.
24	MR. BUIKEMA: Sorry to interrupt, Your Honor.
25	It's actually in the Michigan Court of Appeals from the

1	Oakland County Circuit Court.
2	MR. WOODWARD: I have the number here, I don't
3	know the entire progress of that.
4	THE COURT: It's an appeal from the Oakland County
5	to the Michigan Court of Appeals, okay.
6	MR. WOODWARD: Okay. So, I believe that the
7	University would use that, if my website was taken
8	down, so that they could say, "He liable and
9	slandered", et cetera, against me to hinder my appeal
10	process.
11	THE COURT: Well, let me say this, if I were to
12	order preliminary injunction, I would condition it on
13	the University not being able to use that in any way,
14	shape or form in the Appellate Court.
15	MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Your Honor.
16	MR. BUIKEMA: And we'd so stipulate.
17	MR. WOODWARD: Great. Okay.
18	THE COURT: Okay. We've made great progress.
19	MR. WOODWARD: That was one of my that I had
20	concerns over.
21	THE COURT: Sure.
22	MR. WOODWARD: I would also like it if they not
23	mention this in any of the blogs or public view, et
24	cetera, that are used to communicate information about
25	all the schools in Antigua. And there are other blogs

and Facebook pages, that they can't use that against me to discredit my information.

So, if they say, "Ha, ha, we took down your website --"

THE COURT: How do you respond to that?

RESPONSE BY MR. BUIKEMA

MR. BUIKEMA: Well, I can assure you that we wouldn't say, "Ha, ha, we took down your website."

I think it would be up to my client as to what, if anything, to do with a preliminary injunction ruling.

A preliminary injunction ruling is simply that, it's not a finding on the merits of the case, it's simply a preliminary injunction.

I think we're entitled, if one so chose, to communicate truthfully that one was granted. And particularly, under the circumstances, as you've heard at best, Mr. Woodward's defending representations on his website, which have existed for a period of time and have been in the pool of idea, so to speak are, at best, made recklessly.

I can't tell you yes we would or no we wouldn't.

I would certainly counsel my client not to publish it widely because there's a pending lawsuit to determine the actual truth or falsity of the contents of his website.

1	But having said that, I think they'd be entitled
2	to inject that, truthfully, into the competing sphere
3	of ideas.
4	THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure what that last
5	phrase mean, "Injecting into the sphere of ideas"?
6	MR. BUIKEMA: In any campaign of information where
7	certain information is inaccurate or has been
8	prohibited, I think that's information that perspective
9	students or consumers should be entitled to.
10	THE COURT: How would your client make this
11	communication? How would it come out?
12	MR. BUIKEMA: I don't think they would. To tell
13	you the truth, and I think I started my remarks by
14	saying that I don't think they would. And I would
15	counsel them not to, pending a final resolution in this
16	case.
17	But having said that, I think that they're
18	entitled to or it's, "Public knowledge", is a better
19	way of saying it, that a preliminary injunction was
20	granted.
21	THE COURT: I think I would condition them on not,
22	until we get this all settled down, them not initiating
23	any kind of information along that line.
24	MR. BUIKEMA: I understand.

25

RESPONSE BY MR. WOODWARD

1	MR. WOODWARD: I would appreciate that, Your
2	Honor, because one of my videos demonstrates how they
3	manipulate other websites on the internet to remove
4	information that they don't like.
5	THE COURT: All right. What else? Does that
6	solve all your problems?
7	MR. WOODWARD: What I would like to do, Your
8	Honor can I use your board?
9	THE COURT: Sure.
10	MR. WOODWARD: Okay. In doing so, Your Honor, and
11	me taking down my website, it could change the
12	positioning of my website on the internet itself, where
13	currently my website is there.
14	And if it's and if I totally delete my website,
15	then it could be on page it could end up being on
16	page, like, 56 or whatever, in the listing of the
17	internet.
18	And what I suggest, if I may use the board is
19	are you aware with how websites are developed and
20	designed, Your Honor?
21	THE COURT: Not completely, but go ahead.
22	MR. WOODWARD: What you have, you have an index
23	page that's called, "Index" on HTML; and underneath
24	that page there's other web pages containing
25	information, Your Honor.

This page is called, "www.aua-med.com/index.html", 1 2 that's its address. 3 If I change this file to just say whatever you feel is fair, "Under Review", I'm currently working, 4 "Under Construction", something that does not say that 5 6 it has an injunction against it, then when somebody 7 goes here, Your Honor, I have claims made to the 8 Department of Education concerning this institution. I have the Michigan Attorney General, I sent links 9 10 to him. The Federal Trade Commission, International Trade Commission, the FBI, I've sent this information 11 to, Your Honor, concerning this school. 12 13 It took me from December 11th 'til I think the 12th before I got a claim form back from the Department 14 15 of Education concerning the release of these student 16 grades. 17 So, if these people go to a cite that says it has 18 an injunction against it or isn't there, then they won't come back to the site --19 20 **THE COURT:** What do you suggest the website say? 21 MR. WOODWARD: Under construction or maintenance. 22 THE COURT: Okay. In which case, all this 23 information will be withheld? 24 MR. WOODWARD: What will happen, if I say, 25 "Maintenance" on this page right here, then the only

way that this information will be available is if they actually go to whatever this file made was and view that information. They would have to go to a directory and then into an index directory.

So, it wouldn't totally shut -- I mean, you're always going to get this information. The way to get rid of everything would be to delete everything and it would take months to get this stuff back together -- not that long, I take that back. It would take me a long time to rebuild this site, to upload all these files. It would take me a long time to rebuild everything.

If I said, "Maintenance", then all I need to do is change the wording of this file, change this file to "Maintenance", and then somebody looks at it and it says, "Under Maintenance". And then they go away.

Without knowing the directory structure that they would have to know for downloads, they would have to know, "aua-med.com/download/index/html", then I don't have to tear down my entire site.

### RESPONSE BY MR. BUIKEMA

MR. BUIKEMA: I cannot help the manner in which Mr. Woodward has constructed his site.

But if you're asking him to unrob a bank, I think you should ask him to unrob the bank in its entirety.

And he should be responsible for the complications associated with that.

It's not just the index site that contains false and defamatory information. It's all these pages with substantive or purportedly substantive facts about my client's business, which go beyond even his website that published Youtube videos that he has narrated and given to other sites.

He needs to be prohibited from publishing the false and defamatory information in whatever form or shape that he has published it. Not simply in a way that's convenient to him or saves him time in reconstruction of the same should he prevail on the merits eventually.

# RESPONSE BY MR. WOODWARD

2.0

MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor, I'm not guilty of robing a bank yet, I'm just going to work for two months and I leave tomorrow.

If I completely delete all this information then my listing is gone; then if I am innocent, then to get back on the first page of that listing on the search engines would be extremely difficult.

THE COURT: If you put maintenance where you are, you're going to stay in line there, aren't you?

MR. WOODWARD: I'm going to stay in line. If I

just put maintenance on this one page, then I'll stay in line.

THE COURT: And then delete the other, you'll still stay in line, won't you?

MR. WOODWARD: I don't know, Your Honor. I can't imagine deleting all of that information out of there.

THE COURT: Well, here's my concern. I'm not prepared today to go through each and every statement as to whether it's false or not; it may be, may not be. It could take days and weeks and I'm not going to go through all that. And you've got to leave, you don't have time to go through that now.

However, on the other hand, I'm concerned that if there's some false information on there, it shouldn't be on there. And if we can put maintenance on there and still hold your page, then maybe you can sit down with brother counsel at a later point and say, "All right, here's what I want to do, I'm going to put this statement, this statement; this is a matter of opinion --"

MR. WOODWARD: How about this, Your Honor, as far as a happy median? The stuff like I use downloads, for example, the download file or directory, if I rename that to, "Dash-1", then the odds of somebody finding that file, they'd never find that information because

none of the links that they had would match it.

### RESPONSE BY MR. BUIKEMA

2.0

MR. BUIKEMA: I'm not interested in limited odds of somebody finding false and defamatory information. I'm interested in it being removed from publication.

You know, Mr. Woodward being in line or deleting this stuff, it's a red herring, Your Honor. These are computer files. They're not being deleted.

What he's saying is they need to be deleted from publication, which is exactly the purpose of this motion. I don't know want them published in any way, shape or form, nor should they be.

If he wants to list, "Under Construction", under his primary website, that's fine with me. I don't need it to say, you know, "Prevented" or "See injunction"; under construction is fine.

But there needs to be no means to access the links, the derivative information, the Youtube information, by Google search or by any other means. It's in publication. He needs to remove it from publication. That does not equal deleting the files themselves. He can maintain those and republish those at a later date, if the Court finds so entitled.

THE COURT: What about that?

#### RESPONSE BY MR. WOODWARD

MR. WOODWARD: Like I said, Your Honor, that would be extremely difficult for me. I'm gone for two months.

The plaintiff claims that he has irreparable damage. I don't understand why he even brought this up now since he's known about my site since June of last year. Even April of last year, his partners have known about this site.

Since April of 2009, I contacted the Management Department of St. Joseph Mercy Hospital and they knew of my website. They knew of the content of the website.

They have discredit me on these public programs, on these public blogs. Their own people, on their public blogs, is one of my exhibits here, Your Honor. As far back as June of last year, were aware of the contents of my website as far back as that far, they've known about my website.

They've had to have known about it because just on the listing of it, I'm five listings down if they just search for it.

Now, all of a sudden, I'm creating this irreparable damage and I don't understand where they've said I've caused irreparable damage.

THE COURT: Tell me again about your solution, you

put "Maintenance" and what else you do next?

MR. WOODWARD: Then I'll just rename these directories so that it would be difficult for them to find these directories. If somebody had a link to the directory, it just wouldn't work any more but the information wouldn't be gone off the server.

# RESPONSE BY MR. BUIKEMA

MR. BUIKEMA: Your Honor, this is like the New York Times publishing false and defamatory information and then saying, "Your Honor, the cure is we'll only publish it in certain areas or it will be difficult to find our newspapers", it's not appropriate.

THE COURT: I'm not satisfied that they're false, there's your problem; not yours, his too, okay.

Because if I do what you're saying I should do, we may be depriving him of the right to publish correct information.

MR. BUIKEMA: I started my remarks by acknowledging that Mr. Woodward has a complete right to express his opinion.

THE COURT: I understand that. Some of these I think are opinions. It seems to me that his solution is reasonable, under the circumstances. It's going to certainly decrease the amount of publication and the amount of people that would be able to see it until

2 So, I'm going to order that you make maintenance

#### RESPONSE BY MR. WOODWARD

further order of the Court.

and then what's the other?

MR. WOODWARD: And then I'll change the directory names so that they won't be able to -- matter of fact, Your Honor, what I'll do to make it even harder is I'll rename the index file so that they won't even be able to automatically go into the directory and bring up the content of the directory. That would make it more difficult for them to access more information.

THE COURT: All right. Then that's the way we we'll proceed.

MR. WOODWARD: Your Honor, can I also address his Youtube issue?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. WOODWARD: On the videos on Youtube, I'll mark all of them as "Private" and then only myself, I don't have any people that I've given permission to any of this other stuff. I'll mark all those private so they won't be accessible on Youtube.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WOODWARD: Everything else on the internet, again, people have copied this stuff and download it. Again, this stuff is on MSN, their video lists, it's

1 all over, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: You can do that what you say you do 3 before you leave? MR. WOODWARD: I'll work on it as soon as I get 4 5 home, Your Honor. 6 **THE COURT:** So, you can do it before you leave? 7 MR. WOODWARD: Yes, Your Honor. 8 Decision By The Court 9 THE COURT: Then do. 10 All right. With that understanding, I'm not sure that we need a preliminary injunction. I'm satisfied 11 that what Mr. Woodward says he'll do, he'll do. And if 12 13 he does that, that will solve the problem, for the time being, so there won't be a preliminary injunction and 14 that's what you're getting in your favor. 15 16 issuing one. 17 MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Doesn't mean I'm not going to, 19 eventually. 2.0 MR. WOODWARD: Yes, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: But based on your representation what 22 you will do and do it before you leave, we'll just 23 leave it as is. And somehow, can you send a 24 communication to the Court and brother counsel as to 25 exactly what you've done?

1	MR. WOODWARD: Yes, Your Honor, I'll take video
2	shots of what I've changed, so you'll have a picture
3	from my screen of everything that's been done.
4	THE COURT: Can you do that by way of email to the
5	Court?
6	MR. WOODWARD: I can email that to Ms. Orem.
7	THE COURT: Hold on. My clerk says to describe
8	what you've done in email by words.
9	THE CLERK: It just overwhelms our emails,
10	oversize files.
11	MR. WOODWARD: I'll describe what I've done, yes,
12	Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Copies, of course, to counsel.
14	MR. WOODWARD: Yes, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: All right. Court's in recess.
16	RESPONSE BY MR. BUIKEMA
17	MR. BUIKEMA: Your Honor, I'm sorry.
18	THE COURT: Sure, go ahead.
19	MR. BUIKEMA: Have we agreed to a stay then while
20	Mr. Woodward is absent?
21	THE COURT: A stay of what?
22	MR. BUIKEMA: A stay of proceedings, of discovery.
23	THE COURT: Sure, yes. It will be a stay until he
24	gets back.
25	And you're going to get a lawyer, you said, as

1	soon as you get back?
2	MR. WOODWARD: Yes, Your Honor, I should have
3	somebody when I get back.
4	MR. BUIKEMA: And Your Honor, could we just have a
5	date certain as to when the case would be re-opened?
6	MR. WOODWARD: I'll be back no later than the end
7	of June.
8	THE COURT: All right. Then what I'd like you to
9	do then by July 15th, send an email to the Court and to
LO	brother counsel telling us the status of the lawyer
L1	search, okay. I have a lawyer and his or her name is
L2	such and such and I need another week or to so we know
L3	what's going on.
L4	MR. WOODWARD: I'll notify you as soon as I get
L5	back too, Your Honor, because it could be earlier than
L6	that. I just don't want to be late.
L7	THE COURT: My Clerk reminds me, we scheduled this
L8	case so you've got a copy of this. So, the lawyer you
L9	get should get a copy of this and discovery ends on
20	September 15th and witnesses by September 15th. So,
21	you've got a copy of this and make sure your lawyer
22	gets it quickly.
23	MR. WOODWARD: Yes, sir.
24	MR. BUIKEMA: Thank you, Your Honor.
25	(Whereupon proceedings concluded at 3:13 p.m.)

Case	2:10-cv-10978-PJD-MJH ECF No. 19, PageID.263 Filed 08/03/10 Page 63 of 63
	Response By Mr. Buikema 63 Monday/April 19, 2010
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	CERTIFICATION
6	I, Nefertiti A. Matthews, official court reporter
7	for the United States District Court, Eastern District of
8	Michigan, Southern Division, appointed pursuant to the
9	provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753,
10	do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct
11	transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause
12	on the date hereinbefore set forth.
13	I do further certify that the foregoing
14	transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction.
15	
16	Date: August 2, 2010
17	
18	s:/Nefertiti A. Matthews Nefertiti A. Matthews,
19	Official Court Reporter
20	
21	
22	
23	